



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/698,201      | 10/30/2000  | Tae-kyung Kim        | 1293.1144/MDS       | 6730             |

21171 7590 04/07/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHU, KIM KWOK

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2653

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/698,201

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Kim-Kwok CHU

Art Unit

2653

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 3/19/04 (paper 9) FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
- NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.
3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-48, 50-59, 61-73 and 75-82.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 49, 60 and 74.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Continuation of 2. NOTE:

1. in claim 49, line 1, the deleted term "optical" should be --optical element--; and
2. in claim 49, line 12, the amended feature "the second lens" is not claimed before and this additional limitation requires further consideration and search.


Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- 1 with respect to claim 60, in the Remarks filed on 3/19/04, on page 19, lines 9-11, Applicant disagrees that the prior art of Zimmerman's lens 130 has a divergent power. Accordingly, in Fig. 6, the lens 130 illustrates its divergent power. Furthermore, in column 9, lines 41-43, Zimmerman teaches that "The laser light continues to expand in the direction of the major axis until it encounters compound lens 132";
2. with respect to claim 60, Applicant states that the prior art of Zimmerman does not disclose that the compound cylindrdical lens 130 is used or is usable with both a 633 nm light and another light beam having a 400nm wavelength (page 18, lines 7-9). Accordingly, the prior art suggests that the lens 130 is used to collimate a laser light beam. Although the laser light's wavelength range is not specified, the lens 130 will function properly as a collimating means in all range of laser light because the spherical aberration is not the issue when using it as a collimator; and
3. similarly, with respect to claim 74, Applicant states that the prior art of Zimmerman does not disclose that the compound cylindrdical lens 130 is used or is usable with both a 633 nm light and another light beam having a 400nm wavelength. Accordingly, the prior art suggests that the lens 130 is used to collimate a laser light beam. Although the laser light's wavelength range is not specified, the lens 130 will function properly as a collimating means in all range of laser light because the spherical aberration is not the issue when using it as a collimator.

Examiner: Kim CHU  
AU 2653

KC 4/5/04

703 305-3032

  
WILLIAM KORZUCH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600